UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/933,493	08/20/2001	Stefan M. van den Oord	MOBJ-01000US0	6164

23910 7590 06/17/2005

FLIESLER MEYER, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER	
BURGESS, BARBARA N	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2157	

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/933,493	VAN DEN OORD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Barbara N. Burgess	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 April 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Amendments filed April 14, 2005. Claims 1-27 are presented for further examination. Claims 28-29 are presented for initial examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1- 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purcell (US 2001/0013038 A1) in view of Schabes et al. (hereinafter "Schabes", US Patent Publication 2002/0123994 A1).

As per claims 1, 19-24, 28-29, Purcell discloses a system and user interface mechanism for session-based retrieval and at a client system of string-based content from a server comprising:

A communication protocol that provides an asynchronous session based connection between a client system and a server system, and allows the client system to send, within a single session, a plurality of query strings to query the server system

for content and to receive, within the same session, matching server content (paragraphs [0011], [0019], [0028]);

- A client object, in communication with a client software at the client system, wherein the client object is adapted to transmit to a server object within a single session, a plurality of queries to retrieve content from said content engine, wherein each of said plurality of queries comprises a query string character, and wherein each subsequent one of the plurality of queries extend the original query string by one or more additional characters (paragraphs [0029]-[0030], [0034]-[0035]);
- A server object, in communication with a server software at said server system, said server object furthermore in communication with the client object via the communication protocol and immediately returns increasingly focused content and information to the client object for use by the client system (paragraphs [0022], [0024], [0030], [0034]-[0036]).

Purcell does not explicitly disclose:

A client object wherein each subsequent one of the plurality of queries extend the original query string by one or more additional characters;

- Server object records each of the plurality of queries received from the client object during the session, and in response to receiving each subsequent character, matches the extending query string against the server content.

However, in an analogous art, Schabes discloses a searching and retrieving documents according to words in a given input query. Query servers may include index and document storage areas (paragraphs [0003, 0067-0068, 0070, 0077]).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Schabes's recording queries in Purcell's system in order for the user to have access to past queries made.

As per claim 2, Purcell discloses the system of claim 1 wherein said client software and said client object operates on or at a first computer and said server software and server object operates on or at a second computer, and wherein both of said first and said second computers are connected via a network protocol that includes said communication protocol (paragraphs [0018]-[0019], [0022], [0024]).

As per claim 3, Purcell discloses the system of claim 1 wherein said server software and said client software runs on the same computer that includes said communication protocol within said computer (paragraph [0024]).

As per claim 4, Purcell discloses the system of claim 1 wherein said server software runs on a plurality of separate computers, and wherein said client queries received during the session are distributed over said separate servers (paragraph [0029]-[0030]).

As per claim 5, Purcell discloses the system of claim 1.
Purcell does not explicitly discloses:

Wherein said server software stores previously used strings and returns said stored strings to the client in response to new client queries received during the session, without accessing said content engine.

However, in an analogous art, Hughes discloses a server database that stores query records (paragraphs [0012]-[0013], [0030], [0039], [0049])

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate storing previously used strings in Purcell's system in order for the user to have access to past queries made.

As per claims 6 and 25, Purcell further discloses the system and mechanism of claims 1 and 24 wherein said client software is embedded into a software application that provides a visual interface to an operator of an asynchronous session and the availability of increasingly focused content information (paragraphs [0018], [0036]).

As per claim 7, Purcell discloses the system of claim 1 wherein said client software is used as a content engine for another software system (paragraphs [0029]-[0030], [0034]-[0035]).

As per claim 8, Purcell discloses the system of claim 1 wherein said client software accumulates a plurality of said single character queries as they are entered into the client, before sending them together to said server software as a single query string (paragraph [0034]).

As per claims 9 and 10, Purcell discloses the system of claim 1 wherein said client software stores previously received responses and uses these as the response to a new query by the user, without reassessing the server (paragraphs [0036]-[0037]).

As per claims 11 and 13, Purcell discloses the system of claim 1.
Purcell does not explicitly disclose wherein said server software stores the state of query and response of the client software, and restores the state of the client software after any interruption in said communication protocol.
However, in an analogous art, Hughes discloses a server database that stores query records (paragraphs [0012]-[0013], [0030], [0039], [0049]).
Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate storing queries and responses in Purcell's system in order for the user to have access to past queries made

As per claim 12, Purcell discloses the system of claim 1 where said client software adds a qualifier to the query that is passed to the content engine by the server, whereby the content engine can use said qualifier to execute the query and return appropriate results based on both the query string and its qualifier (paragraphs [0038]-[0039]).

As per claim 14, Purcell discloses the system of claim 1 where said server software is distributed within a server tier and a syndication tier, and wherein said client software

communicates to the server tier on a single computer, and wherein each query is forwarded by the server tier to an appropriate syndicate of content channels connected to the server tier on a different computer (paragraph [0029]).

As per claim 15, Purcell discloses the system of claim 1 where said server software applies a content engine dependent pattern and filter to characters received from the client before queries are transmitted to the content engine (paragraph [0041]).

As per claim 16, Purcell discloses the system of claim 15 wherein the number of queries transmitted to the content engine is limited (paragraph [0036]).

As per claims 17-18, Purcell further discloses the system of claim 1 where server responses comprise lists of strings, wherein each string is accompanied by corresponding metadata, consisting of one or more strings (paragraph [0029]).

As per claim 25, Purcell discloses the mechanism of claim 24, wherein said user interface element is an application input field.

As per claims 26-27, Purcell discloses the mechanism of claim 24, wherein said session indicator displays a triangular display element to indicate the presence of said session, and does not display said triangular display element to indicate the absence of said session (paragraphs [0034]-[0036]).

Response to Arguments

The Office notes the following argument:

(a) Purcell fails to teach that a plurality of queries may be applied to a server.

(b) Purcell fails to teach a single client querying a single server.

(c) Purcell fails to teach that the server returns increasingly appropriate content information to the client object.

(d) Hughes fails to teach the server recording each query.

In response to:

(a)-(c) Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are not persuasive. Purcell discloses databases accessible through associated servers. Each server has at least one database. In order for the client to receive the information located inside the database, the client must query the server having the respective database. Purcell further discloses the user sending a query to the server to receive information from a target database. Therefore, only one server (single) is queried by the user (client). Purcell explicitly discloses the server(s) returning the necessary and appropriate information to the client based on the query. He also discloses the user performing multiple queries (paragraphs [0005, 0011, 0029, 0036, 0041]). Therefore, Purcell indeed teaches a plurality of queries applied to a server, a single client querying a single server, and the server returning increasingly appropriate content information.

(d) Applicant's argument has been considered but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara N Burgess whose telephone number is (703) 305-3366. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00am-4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Barbara N Burgess Examiner

Art Unit 2157

June 12, 2005

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100